

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,628	10/18/2004	Walter Schneider	2732-143	8618
6449 7590 01/03/2008 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER	
			JOLLEY, KIRSTEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
	:			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/03/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	10/511,628	SCHNEIDER, WALTER			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kirsten C. Jolley	1792			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address –			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Oc	ctober 2007.				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-13,20 and 21 is/are</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 14-18 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	withdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 10.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(c)					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/18/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

10/511,628 Art Unit: 1792

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election of group II, claims 14-19, and of the species A (material that is optically changeable by an electric field) in the reply filed on October 15, 2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0721176 A2 in view of Sheridon (US 4,143,103).

EP '176 discloses a method for producing a display medium comprising applying to a substrate a material that is optically changeable by an electric field, the optically changeable material being produced by enclosing changeable particles in microcapsules and incorporating them in a binder. EP '176 lacks a teaching that the optically changeable material is applied to the substrate in a nonactivated (non-swollen) state. Sheridon similarly discloses the manufacture of a display incorporating optically changeable particles. Sheridon teaches that the particles are

Application/Control Number:

10/511,628 Art Unit: 1792

first incorporated into a material and hardened to form a sheet and then the sheet is swollen with dielectric solvent to render the particles movable therein. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, upon seeing the references of EP '176 and Sheridon in combination, to have first applied the particles of EP '176 in microcapsules in a binder to a substrate (in a nonactivated state), and then thereafter apply a dielectric solvent to provide swelling to render the particles moveable within the microcapsules, upon seeing Sheridon's teaching that the swelling to make particles movable may be performed as a second/latter step after inclusion of the particles in the product. The test of obviousness is not express suggestion of the claimed invention in any or all references but rather what the references taken collectively would suggest to those of ordinary skill in the art presumed to be familiar with them. *In re Rosselet*, 347 F.2d 847, 146 USPQ 183 (CCPA 1965); *In re Hedges*, 783 F.2d 1038.

Regarding the production of a security document, it is noted that EP '176 is directed to the production of display surfaces where there is an intention to conceal, and which may be paper-like (col. 4, lines 39-46 and 57-58; col. 5, lines 9-12). It is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to have incorporated the coating of EP '176 into a security document upon seeing EP '176's teachings that the product is paper-like and may be used where there is an intention to conceal or camouflage, which is frequently the purpose of a security document.

As to claim 15, the microparticles in EP '176's coating material would be characterized as pigments since they supply color (black or white) to the coating.

As to claims 16-17, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious an engineer skilled in the art to have used the coating material of EP '176 in view of Sheridon to

Application/Control Number:

10/511,628

Art Unit: 1792

either provide information or act as a security layer on a document as a matter of design preference since EP '176 teaches that its coating material may "conceal."

### Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the claimed method comprising use of a coating material including both microcapsules containing the swelling agent required for activation in combination with microcapsules containing the optically changeable material, and activation of the optically changeable material by destroying the microcapsules with the swelling agent.

#### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kirsten C. Jolley whose telephone number is 571-272-1421. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Tuesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/511,628

Art Unit: 1792

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1792

kcj